Relations among Out-degree, Controllability and Observability of a Networked System

Tong Zhou

arXiv:1610.02192v1 [math.OC] 7 Oct 2016

***Abstract*—Some novel sufficient conditions are derived respectively for the controllability and observability of a networked system, as well as some necessary conditions. These conditions depends only separately on parameters of each subsystem and its out-degree. It has been made clear that in order to guarantee controllability/observability of a networked system, each subsystem should be controllable/observable. In addition, both sparse and dense subsystem connections are helpful in making the whole system controllable/observable. An explicit formula is given for the smallest number of inputs/outputs for each subsystem required to guarantee controllability/observability of the whole system.**

Key Words: **controllability, large scale system, networked system, out-degree, observability.**

I. Introduction

With the increment of the dimension of a system, which is mainly due to technology developments in sensors, communications, etc., as well as more complicated and demanding tasks expected for a system, computation costs and numerical stability become an essential issue in system analysis and synthesis [8], [10], [13], [17]. It is now widely recognized that with the increment of its subsystem number, direct applications of results about a lumped system to a large scale or networked system may often result in an exponential increment of computation time and storage requirements [2], [4], [8], [10], [13]. To make things worse, these direct applications are usually numerically unreliable. A well known example is to compute the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of a square matrix, which is often required in analyzing system properties and designing a controller. If this matrix has a large dimension and its condition number is large, then, the computation results of all the available algorithms are generally far from the actual values [3], [12], [13]. To overcome these difficulties, various efforts have emerged recently for the analysis and synthesis of a networked system. Among which, an extensively studied problem is about system controllability/observability verifications [1], [4], [6], [7], [9], [13], [15].

Various results have now been obtained for this important theoretical issue on systems and control. For example, robustness of structural controllability, input addition, decentralized controllability, etc., have been investigated respectively in [1], [7]. It is declared in [5] that finding the sparest input/output matrix such that a networked system is controllable/observable is NP-hard, and some algorithms are suggested in [9], [6] to approximately solve this minimal controllability/observability problem. Structural controllability and the cavity method are used in [4] to derive a set of driver nodes for assuring system controllability. In [13], we have obtained a necessary and sufficient condition for an arbitrarily connected networked system, which depends separately on parameters of each subsystem. These results have been extended to situations in which the full column normal rank (FCNR) condition adopted in [13] is not satisfied [14], there are constraints on system inputs and states [15], as well as there are subsystems that are not directly influenced by external inputs [18].

In this paper, we investigate relations among subsystem observability/controllabilty, subsystem out-degree and system observability/controllability. It has been made clear that in order to construct an observable/controllable networked system, each subsystem should be observable/controllable. A sufficient condition is derived for system observability which depends separately only on parameters of each subsystem and its out-degree. This condition reveals that both sparse and dense subsystem connections may be helpful to make the whole system observable/controllable. On the basis of these results, it is further proved that in order to construct an observable/controllable networked system, the number of inputs/outputs in each subsystem must at least be equal to that of the maximum value of the dimension of the space spanned by the eigenvectors of its state transition matrix associated with the same eigenvalue.

The outline of this paper is as follows. At first, Section II gives a state space model for networked dynamic systems and some preliminary results. Relations between controllability/observability of a networked dynamic system and subsystem out-degree are investigated in Section III. A minimal input/output problem is discussed in Section IV. Finally, some concluding remarks are given in Section V. An appendix is included to give proofs of some technical results.

The following notation and symbols are adopted. $\mathcal{R}^{m\times n}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{m\times n}$ are utilized respectively to represent the set consisting of $m\times n$ dimensional real and complex matrices. When m and/or n are equal to 1, they are usually omitted. $\mathbf{diag}\{X_i|_{i=1}^L\}$ denotes a block diagonal matrix with its i-th diagonal block being X_i, while $\mathbf{col}\{X_i|_{i=1}^L\}$ the vector/matrix stacked by $X_i|_{i=1}^L$ with its i-th row block vector/matrix being X_i. 0_m and $0_{m\times n}$ represent respectively the m dimensional zero column vector and the $m\times n$ dimensional zero matrix. The superscripts T and H are used to denote respectively the transpose and the conjugate transpose of a matrix/vector, while $||\cdot||_2$ the Euclidean norm of a vector.

This work was supported in part by the NNSFC under Grant 61573209 and 51361135705.

T.Zhou is with the Department of Automation and TNList, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, CHINA. (Tel: 86-10-62797430; Fax: 86-10-62786911; e-mail: tzhou@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn.)

II. System Model and Some Preliminaries

Consider a networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ consisting of N linear time invariant (LTI) dynamic subsystems. Assume that the dynamics of its i-th subsystem $\mathbf{\Sigma}_i$ is described by

$$\begin{bmatrix} x(t+1,i) \\ z(t,i) \\ y(t,i) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i) & A_{\mathbf{TS}}(i) & B_{\mathbf{T}}(i) \\ A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i) & A_{\mathbf{SS}}(i) & B_{\mathbf{S}}(i) \\ C_{\mathbf{T}}(i) & C_{\mathbf{S}}(i) & D(i) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(t,i) \\ v(t,i) \\ u(t,i) \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

Moreover, assume that interactions among its subsystems are described by

$$v(t) = \Phi z(t) \quad (2)$$

Here, $z(t) = \mathbf{col}\{z(t,i)|_{i=1}^N\}$ and $v(t) = \mathbf{col}\{v(t,i)|_{i=1}^N\}$. Moreover, t and i stand respectively for the temporal variable and the index number of a subsystem, $x(t,i)$ represents the state vector of the i-th subsystem $\mathbf{\Sigma}_i$ at time t, $z(t,i)$ and $v(t,i)$ respectively its output vector to other subsystems and input vector from other subsystems, $y(t,i)$ and $u(t,i)$ respectively its output vector and input vector.

Similar to the treatments adopted in [13], [15], in order to distinguish the output vector $z(t,i)$ (the input vector $v(t,i)$) from the output vector $y(t,i)$ (the input vector $u(t,i)$), $z(t,i)$ and $v(t,i)$ are called internal output/input vectors, while $y(t,i)$ and $u(t,i)$ external output/input vectors.

Throughout this paper, it is assumed that the dimensions of the vectors $x(t,i)$, $v(t,i)$, $u(t,i)$, $z(t,i)$ and $y(t,i)$, are respectively $m_{\mathbf{x}i}$, $m_{\mathbf{v}i}$, $m_{\mathbf{u}i}$, $m_{\mathbf{z}i}$ and $m_{\mathbf{y}i}$.

As in [13], [15], [14], [18], we also adopt the assumption here that the subsystem connection matrix (SCM) Φ is a constant matrix, and each of its rows has only one nonzero element which is equal to one. As argued before, this assumption does not introduce any restrictions on the structure of the whole system.

To investigate controllability and observability of System $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, the following results are required which are widely known as the PBH test [12], [13].

Lemma 1. Consider a discrete LTI system with the following state space model

$$x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bd(t), \qquad y(t) = Cx(t) + Dw(t) \quad (3)$$

- This system is controllable, if and only if for every complex scalar λ, the matrix $[\lambda I - A \;\; B]$ is of full row rank (FRR).
- This system is observable, if and only if for every complex scalar λ, the matrix $\mathbf{col}\{\lambda I - A,\; C\}$ is of full column rank (FCR).

To avoid awkward statements, we sometimes also use an expression like that the matrix pair $(A,\; C)$ is observable, and that the matrix pair $(A,\; B)$ is controllable, when the corresponding system of Equation (3) is.

The next lemma provides some characteristics of a plant transmission zero, which is closely related to the existence of a nonzero plant input vector sequence that makes its output vector constantly equal to zero [12].

Lemma 2. Let $G(\lambda)$ be a proper transfer function matrix (TFM) having FCNR. Then, a complex number λ_0 is a transmission zero of this TFM, if and only if there exists a nonzero complex vector z_0 satisfying $G(\lambda_0)z_0 = 0$.

To make mathematical derivations more concise, the following matrix symbols are adopted throughout this paper. $A_{*\#} = \mathbf{diag}\{A_{*\#}(i)|_{i=1}^N\}$, $B_* = \mathbf{diag}\{B_*(i)|_{i=1}^N\}$, $C_* = \mathbf{diag}\{C_*(i)|_{i=1}^N\}$ and $D = \mathbf{diag}\{D(i)|_{i=1}^N\}$, in which $*, \# = \mathbf{T}$ or $\mathbf{S}$. Moreover, denote $\mathbf{col}\{u(t,i)|_{i=1}^N\}$, $\mathbf{col}\{x(t,i)|_{i=1}^N\}$ and $\mathbf{col}\{y(t,i)|_{i=1}^N\}$ respectively by $u(t)$, $x(t)$ and $y(t)$. Furthermore, define integers $M_{\star i}$ and $M_\star$ as $M_\star = \sum_{k=1}^N m_{\star k}$, $M_{\star 0} = 0$, $M_{\star i} = \sum_{k=1}^i m_{\star k}$ with $1 \le i \le N$. Here, $\star = \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{v}$ or $\mathbf{z}$.

In addition, it is assumed that the dynamic system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is well-posed. That is, the matrix $I - \Phi A_{\mathbf{SS}}$ is invertible.

The following results have been established in [13] which are starting points of this paper.

Lemma 3. Define a matrix valued polynomial (MVP) $M(\lambda)$ as

$$M(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}} & -A_{\mathbf{TS}} \\ -C_{\mathbf{T}} & -C_{\mathbf{S}} \\ -\Phi A_{\mathbf{ST}} & I_{M_{\mathbf{v}}} - \Phi A_{\mathbf{SS}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

Assume that the networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is well-posed. Then, it is observable, if and only if for every complex scalar λ, the MVP $M(\lambda)$ is of FCR.

III. Out-degree, Controllability and Observability of a Networked System

To investigate controllability and observability of the networked system Σ, the following property of the SCM Φ is at first introduced. This property is firstly observed in [17] and plays important roles in stability analysis of this system, as well as its robust stability.

Let $m(i)$ stand for the number of subsystems that is directly affected by the i-th element of the vector $z(t)$, $i = 1,\; 2,\; \cdots,\; M_{\mathbf{z}}$. Define matrices $\Theta(j)$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, and Θ respectively as

$$\Theta(j) = \mathbf{diag}\left\{ \sqrt{m(i)}\Big|_{i=M_{\mathbf{z},j-1}+1}^{M_{\mathbf{z},j}} \right\}$$

$$\Theta = \mathbf{diag}\left\{ \sqrt{m(i)}\Big|_{i=1}^{M_{\mathbf{z}}} \right\}$$

On the basis of the property that $e_k e_k^T = \mathbf{diag}\{0_{k-1}^T,\; 1,\; 0_{M_{\mathbf{z}}-k}^T\}$ and the special structure of the SCM Φ, it has been proved in [17] that

$$\Phi^T\Phi = \Theta^2 = \mathbf{diag}\left\{ \Theta^2(j)\big|_{j=1}^N \right\} \quad (5)$$

in which e_k represents the k-th canonical basis vector of the linear space $\mathcal{R}^{M_{\mathbf{z}}}$.

Obviously from the definition of $m(i)$, we have that $\sum_{i=M_{\mathbf{z},j-1}+1}^{M_{\mathbf{z},j}} m(i)$ equals the out-degree of the j-th subsystem of the networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$.

On the basis of this relation and Lemma 3, a necessary condition is obtained for the observability of System Σ. Its proof is given in the appendix.

Theorem 1. Assume that the dynamic system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is well-posed. Then, this dynamic system is observable only if for each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, the following matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i), \mathbf{col}\{C_{\mathbf{T}}(i),\; A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)\})$ is observable.

From the state space model of the subsystem $\mathbf{\Sigma}_i$, it is clear that both the vector $y(t,i)$ and the vector $z(t,i)$ are its

output vectors. In other words, when this subsystem is isolated from the influences of other subsystems, and its influences to other subsystems are also completely removed, then, the observability of the subsystem $\mathbf{\Sigma}_i$ is equivalent to that of the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i), \mathbf{col}\{C_{\mathbf{T}}(i),\ A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)\})$. Hence, the results of Theorem 1 therefore imply that, in order to construct an observable networked system, each of its subsystem should be observable.

Note that observability of the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i), \mathbf{col}\{C_{\mathbf{T}}(i),\ A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)\})$ is not equivalent to that of the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i),\ C_{\mathbf{T}}(i))$. In fact, from Lemma 1, it is clear that if the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i),\ C_{\mathbf{T}}(i))$ is observable, then, the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i), \mathbf{col}\{C_{\mathbf{T}}(i),\ \ A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)\})$ is certainly also observable; but the converse is in general not true. Results of Theorem 1 therefore also imply that even when there exist subsystems that are not observable through *only* their own external outputs, the whole networked system may still be observable by means of subsystem connections.

It is worthwhile to note that while similar results have been observed in [18] for system controllability, the conclusions there depend on the SCM Φ. This makes them difficult to be applied in constructing a networked system that is controllable, as an appropriate subsystem connection may not be known before system designs. On the other hand, note that $\mathbf{col}\{\lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}},\ -C_{\mathbf{T}},\ -\Phi A_{\mathbf{ST}}\} = \mathbf{diag}\{I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}},\ -I_{M_{\mathbf{y}}},\ -\Phi\}\mathbf{col}\{\lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}},\ C_{\mathbf{T}},\ A_{\mathbf{ST}}\}$. Similar arguments as those in the proof of Theorem 1 show that its conclusions are in fact valid for an arbitrary SCM Φ, provided it is time invariant.

Define TFMs $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$ and $G^{[2]}(\lambda)$ respectively as

$$G^{[1]}(\lambda) = \mathbf{diag}\{G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)|_{i=1}^N\}$$
$$G^{[2]}(\lambda) = \mathbf{diag}\{G_i^{[2]}(\lambda)|_{i=1}^N\}$$

Here, for each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, the TFMs $G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)$ and $G_i^{[2]}(\lambda)$ have the following definitions,

$$G_i^{[1]}(\lambda) = C_{\mathbf{S}}(i) + C_{\mathbf{T}}(i)[\lambda I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i)]^{-1}A_{\mathbf{TS}}(i)$$
$$G_i^{[2]}(\lambda) = A_{\mathbf{SS}}(i) + A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)[\lambda I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i)]^{-1}A_{\mathbf{TS}}(i)$$

From the block diagonal structure of the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$, it is clear that this TFM is of FCNR if and only if each of the TFMs $G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)$, $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$, is.

Assume that the TFMs $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$ and $G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)$ have respectively m and m_i distinctive transmission zeros. Then, under the condition that the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$ is of FCNR, it is obvious from Lemma 2 and $G^{[1]}(\lambda) = \mathbf{diag}\{G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)|_{i=1}^N\}$ that, for each $i = 1, \cdots, N$, every transmission zero of $G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)$ is also a transmission zero of $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$. As argued in [13], we generally only have that $\max_{1\le i\le N} m_i \le m \le \sum_{i=1}^N m_i$. Moreover, for each of the transmission zeros of the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$, there exists at least one integer i belonging to the set $\{1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ N\}$, such that it is also a transmission zero of the TFM $G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)$.

Let $\lambda_0^{[k]}$ denote the k-th transmission zero of the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. Assume that in the TFM set $\{G_1^{[1]}(\lambda),\ G_2^{[1]}(\lambda),\ \cdots,\ G_N^{[1]}(\lambda)\}$, there are $s^{[k]}$ TFMs which has this transmission zero. Denote them by $G_{k(s)}^{[1]}(\lambda)$, $s = 1, \cdots, s^{[k]}$. Clearly, both $s^{[k]}$ and $k(s)$ belong to the set $\{1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ N\}$. As in [13], it is assumed, without any loss of generality, that $k(1) < k(2) < \cdots < k(s^{[k]})$. Let $Y_s^{[k]}$ denote the matrix constructed from a set of linear independent vectors that span the null space of $G_{k(s)}^{[1]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})$. That is,

$$Y_s^{[k]} = \begin{bmatrix} y_{s,1}^{[k]} & y_{s,2}^{[k]} & \cdots & y_{s,p(k,s)}^{[k]} \end{bmatrix}$$

and for each complex vector $y_s^{[k]}$ satisfying $G_{k(s)}^{[1]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})y_s^{[k]} = 0$, there exists one and only one vector α, such that

$$y_s^{[k]} = Y_s^{[k]}\alpha$$

Moreover, $y_s^{[k]} \neq 0$ if and only if $\alpha \neq 0$. Here, $p(k, s)$ stands for the dimension of the aforementioned null space.

Obviously, the matrix $Y_s^{[k]}$ is of FCR, which further leads to that the matrix $Y_s^{[k]H}Y_s^{[k]}$ is positive definite. Hence, the matrix $\Gamma_s^{[k]}$ is well defined for each $s = 1, 2, \cdots, s^{[k]}$ and each $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, which has the following definitions

$$\Gamma_s^{[k]} = G_{k(s)}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})Y_s^{[k]}\left(Y_s^{[k]H}Y_s^{[k]}\right)^{-1/2} \tag{6}$$

Using these matrices, the following conclusions are derived, which give a sufficient condition for the observability of the networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$.

Theorem 2. Assume that the dynamic system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is well-posed and all the TFMs $G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)|_{i=1}^N$ are of FCNR. Then, the dynamic system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is observable, if for each transmission zero of the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$, which is denoted by $\lambda_0^{[k]}$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, the matrix Θ satisfy the following inequality

$$I_{p(k,s)} - \Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]} > 0 \tag{7}$$

for each $s = 1, 2, \cdots, s^{[k]}$, or satisfy the following inequality

$$I_{p(k,s)} - \Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]} < 0 \tag{8}$$

for each $s = 1, 2, \cdots, s^{[k]}$.

The proof of this theorem is deferred to the appendix.

Compared with the results reported in [13], the conditions of Theorem 2 are only sufficient. On the other hand, these conditions can be verified individually for each subsystem and therefore have a much lower computational complexity, and the computation results are generally more numerically reliable. In addition, note that the matrix Θ is closely related to the out-degrees of the networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. Theorem 2 in fact establishes a relation between the observability of a networked system and its subsystem out-degrees.

Note that for each $j = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, $\Theta(j) \ge I_{m_{\mathbf{z}j}}$ from its definition. It can be easily understood that if there is an integer pair (k, s) with $k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ and $s \in \{1, 2, \cdots, s^{[k]}\}$, such that the associated matrix $\Gamma_s^{[k]}$ is not of FCR, then, for all the subsystem connection matrix Φ, the associated inequality $I_{p(k,s)} - \Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]} < 0$ can not be satisfied. Hence, to satisfy conditions of Theorem 2, one possible approach is to meet the requirement of $I_{p(k,s)} - \Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]} > 0$. This might be achieved by reducing the number of subsystems that an internal output straightforwardly affects. These observations mean that under such a situation, sparse connections among subsystems might be helpful to make a networked system observable.

On the contrary, if for each $s = 1, 2, \cdots, s^{[k]}$ and each $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, the associated matrix $\Gamma_s^{[k]}$ is always of FCR,

then, the minimal eigenvalue of the matrix $\Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]}$ can be made large through increasing the number of subsystems that an internal output directly influences, which implies that the inequality $I_{p(k,s)} - \Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]} < 0$ might be satisfied through simply increasing subsystem connections. That is, dense subsystem connections are appreciated from the viewpoint of system observability.

It is worthwhile to mention that while for each feasible integer pair $(k,\ s)$, the matrix $Y_s^{[k]}$ is not unique, its selection does not have any influences on the satisfaction of the conditions of Equations (7) and (8). To illustrate this, let $\hat{Y}_s^{[k]}$ be a matrix constituted from another set of linear independent vectors that span the null space of $G_{k(s)}^{[1]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})$. Then, according to matrix theories [3], there exists a square and invertible matrix T, such that $\hat{Y}_s^{[k]} = Y_s^{[k]}T$. Therefore, the associated matrix $\hat{\Gamma}_s^{[k]}$ can be expressed as

$$\hat{\Gamma}_s^{[k]} = G_{k(s)}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})Y_s^{[k]}T\left(T^HY_s^{[k]H}Y_s^{[k]}T\right)^{-1/2}$$

Using this expression, direct algebraic manipulations show that

$$I_{p(k,s)}-\hat{\Gamma}_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\hat{\Gamma}_s^{[k]} = \left[T\left(T^HY_s^{[k]H}Y_s^{[k]}T\right)^{-1/2}\right]^H \times \left[I_{p(k,s)}- V\Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]}\right]\left[T\left(T^HY_s^{[k]H}Y_s^{[k]}T\right)^{-1/2}\right]$$

Note that the product of two invertible matrices is still invertible [3]. It can be declared that the matrix product $T(T^HY_s^{[k]H}Y_s^{[k]}T)^{-1/2}$ leads to an invertible matrix. Hence, the positive (negative) definiteness of the matrix $I_{p(k,s)} - \hat{\Gamma}_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\hat{\Gamma}_s^{[k]}$ is equivalent to that of the matrix $I_{p(k,s)} - \Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]}$. That is, satisfaction of the conditions in Theorem 2 does not depend on the basis vector selection for the null space of the TFM $G_{k(s)}^{[1]}(\lambda)$ at $\lambda_0^{[k]}$ with each feasible $(k,\ s)$ pair.

When controllability is to be investigated, by means of the duality between controllability and observability of a LTI system, which has already been adopted in [13], similar results can be derived through completely the same arguments. More precisely, based on this duality and the state space model of the whole system given in [13], it can be directly declared that when the networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is well-posed, it is controllable, if and only if for each complex scale λ, the following MVP $\bar{M}(\lambda)$ is of FRR [13], [18]

$$\bar{M}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}} & -B_{\mathbf{T}} & -A_{\mathbf{TS}}\Phi \\ -A_{\mathbf{ST}} & -B_{\mathbf{S}} & I_{M_{\mathbf{v}}} - A_{\mathbf{SS}}\Phi \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that the transpose of the MVP $\bar{M}(\lambda)$ has completely the same form as that of the MVP $M(\lambda)$. It is not out of imaginations that necessary/sufficient conditions similar to those of Theorems 1 and 2 can be derived for controllability verifications of a networked system.

However, in order to achieve these conclusions, it appears necessary to assume that every column of the SCM Φ only has one nonzero element. While this condition can be satisfied in general through augmenting the subsystem internal output vectors $z(t,i)|_{i=1}^N$ with repeated elements, the augmentation usually violates an associated FCNR condition and therefore greatly restricts applicability of the corresponding results. The details are omitted due to their obviousness and space considerations.

In this paper, we derive another necessary/sufficient condition for system controllability without the aforementioned assumption.

For this purpose, define TFMs $\bar{G}^{[1]}(\lambda)$ and $\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda)$ respectively as $\bar{G}^{[1]}(\lambda) = \mathbf{diag}\{\bar{G}_i^{[1]}(\lambda)|_{i=1}^N\}$ and $\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda) = \mathbf{diag}\{\bar{G}_i^{[2]}(\lambda)|_{i=1}^N\}$, in which $\bar{G}_i^{[1]}(\lambda) = B_{\mathbf{S}}^T(i) + B_{\mathbf{T}}^T(i)[\lambda I_{m_{\mathbf{Ti}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}^T(i)]^{-1}A_{\mathbf{ST}}^T(i)$ and $\bar{G}_i^{[2]}(\lambda) = (G_i^{[2]}(\lambda))^T$. Assume that the TFM $\bar{G}^{[1]}(\lambda)$ has $\bar{m}$ distinctive transmission zeros, and let $\bar{\lambda}_0^{[k]}$ denote the k-th one. Moreover, let $\bar{G}_{\bar{k}(s)}^{[1]}(\lambda)|_{s=1}^{\bar{s}^{[k]}}$ represent the TFMs that have $\bar{\lambda}_0^{[k]}$ as its transmission zero, and $\bar{k}(1) < \bar{k}(2) < \cdots < \bar{k}(\bar{s}^{[k]})$. Furthermore, let $\bar{p}(k,s)$ denote the dimension of the null space of the matrix $\bar{G}_{\bar{k}(s)}^{[1]}(\bar{\lambda}_0^{[k]})$, and $\bar{Y}_s^{[k]}$ the matrix constructed from a set of linear independent vectors that span this null space. Define a matrix $\bar{\Gamma}_s^{[k]}$ as

$$\bar{\Gamma}_s^{[k]} = \bar{G}_{\bar{k}(s)}^{[2]}(\bar{\lambda}_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}_s^{[k]}\left(\bar{Y}_s^{[k]H}\Theta^{-2}(\bar{k}(s))\bar{Y}_s^{[k]}\right)^{-1/2} \quad (9)$$

Then, we have the following results, whose proof is included in the appendix.

Theorem 3. Assume that the networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is well-posed and the TFM $\bar{G}^{[1]}(\lambda)$ is of FCNR. Then, System $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is controllable, only when the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i),\ [B_{\mathbf{T}}(i)\quad A_{\mathbf{TS}}(i)])$ is controllable for every $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$. Moreover, if for each integer pair (k,s) with $k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, \bar{m}\}$ and $s \in \{1, 2, \cdots, \bar{s}^{[k]}\}$, the following matrix inequality is satisfied,

$$I_{\bar{p}(k,s)} - \bar{\Gamma}_s^{[k]H}\bar{\Gamma}_s^{[k]} > 0 \quad (10)$$

then, this system is certainly controllable.

It is interesting to notice that while the necessary condition of Theorem 3 is dual to that of Theorem 1, its sufficient condition differs significantly from that of Theorem 2. Moreover, their proofs are also not completely dual to each other. These are due to that an application of the duality between controllability and observability requires that the SCM Φ satisfies the condition that $\Phi\Phi^T$ is a diagonal matrix, which can not be met in general.

IV. Minimal Input/Output Selection for a Networked System

For a networked system, it is often interesting to know how many sensors are required to monitor its states, as well as how many actuators are required to maneuver its states [6], [9], [8], [11]. Recall that in order to reconstruct the states of a system from measured input-output data, it is necessary that the system is observable. Moreover, controllability is necessary for a system to perform satisfactorily [12], [13]. In this section, we investigates the minimal number of outputs/inputs required for guaranteeing the observability/controllability of a networked system.

For this purpose, the following results are at first introduced, which gives the minimal number of outputs of a lumped system for observability assurance [16].

Lemma 4. Concerning the LTI system of Equation (3), there exists a matrix C such that this system is observable, if and only if the dimension of the output vector $y(t)$ is not smaller than the maximum value of the maximal number of linearly independent right eigenvectors of the STM A associated with the same eigenvalue.

While this result has some theoretical values and may be helpful in designing a lumped system, it can not be directly applied to the design of a networked system in general. Note that subsystems of a networked systems are usually far away from each other geometrically. This makes it infeasible in an engineering practice to have an actuator that simultaneously and directly affects states of two or more different subsystems, or have a sensor to measure the quantity of a linear combination of the states of two or more different subsystems.

In this section, we investigate this minimal input/output selection problem under the restriction that an actuator is permitted to directly affect states of *only* one subsystem, and a sensor is permitted to measure the value of a linear combination of the states *only* in one subsystem. To emphasize this characteristic, an actuator/sensor meeting these restrictions is called a local actuator/sensor.

The following results give an answer to these minimal input/output selection problems for a networked system. Their proof is provided in the appendix.

Theorem 4. Let $p_{max}(i)$ denote the maximum value of the maximal number of linearly independent right eigenvectors of the matrix $A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i)$ associated with the same eigenvalue, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$. Then, an observable networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ can be constructed with local sensors, if and only if

$$m_{\mathbf{y}i} + m_{\mathbf{z}i} \geq p_{max}(i), \qquad \forall i \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ N\ \}$$

Moreover, a controllable networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ can be constructed with local actuators, if and only if

$$m_{\mathbf{u}i} + m_{\mathbf{v}i} \geq p_{max}(i), \qquad \forall i \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ N\ \}$$

The above theorem reveals that in order to reduce the required number of actuators/sensors, it is better to design a subsystem with its state transition matrix having distinctive eigenvalues. This is in a good agreement with the results on a lumped system reported in [16].

Note that the matrices $A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)$, $A_{\mathbf{SS}}(i)$ and $A_{\mathbf{TS}}(i)$ represent connection strengthes among subsystems of the system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. The bigger the magnitude of the elements of these matrices is, the tighter the subsystems are connected [13]. It is clear from the proof of the above theorem that when each subsystem is observable/controllable, it is always possible to construct an observable/controllable networked system through reducing subsystem connection strengthes. In the extreme situation, when all the subsystems are disconnected, the networked system becomes a collection of isolated individual observable/controllable subsystems, which is certainly observable/controllable.

On the other hand, when these matrices are appropriately selected such that the corresponding matrices $\Gamma_s^{[k]}$ is of FCR for each feasible integer pair $(k,\ s)$, it can be easily seen from Equation (8) that through increasing magnitudes of the elements of these matrices, that is, through increasing subsystem connection strengthes, it is also possible to build an observable networked system using observable subsystems. Similar conclusions can be obtained for building a controllable networked system, by means of the duality between observability and controllability.

However, when there are restrictions on the SCM Φ, and/or on subsystem connection strengthes, which is often required in practical engineering [10], [8], [13], further efforts are required to find the minimal number of inputs/outputs for each subsystem in the construction of a controllable/observable system.

V. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have discussed relations among out-degrees, observability and controllability of a networked system. It is observed that to guarantee the observability/controllability of the whole system, each subsystem must be observable/controllable. Moreover, according to properties of subsystems, sparse or dense connections may be helpful in constructing a controllable/observable system. Furthermore, in order to assure controllability/observability, the number of actuators/sensors of every subsystem must not be smaller than the maximum value of the dimension of the eigenvector space of its state transition matrix associated with the same eigenvalue.

Appendix: Proof of Some Technical Results

Proof of Theorem 1: Define MVPs $M_1(\lambda)$ and $\hat{M}_1(\lambda)$ respectively as

$$M_1(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}} \\ -C_{\mathbf{T}} \\ -\Phi A_{\mathbf{ST}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{M}_1(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}} \\ C_{\mathbf{T}} \\ \Theta A_{\mathbf{ST}} \end{bmatrix} \tag{a.1}$$

Assume that the system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is observable. Then, according to Lemma 3, it is necessary that for every complex scalar λ, the MVP $M(\lambda)$ defined in Equation (4) is of FCR. From the definitions of the MVPs $M(\lambda)$ and $M_1(\lambda)$, it is obvious that the MVP $M_1(\lambda)$ must be of FCR at every complex scale λ also, which is equivalent to

$$M_1^H(\lambda) M_1(\lambda) > 0 \tag{a.2}$$

On the basis of Equations (5) and (a.1), the following equality can be straightforwardly established for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\begin{aligned} M_1^H(\lambda) M_1(\lambda) &= (\lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}})^H (\lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}) + \\ &\qquad C_{\mathbf{T}}^T C_{\mathbf{T}} + A_{\mathbf{ST}}^T \Phi^T \Phi A_{\mathbf{ST}} \\ &= (\lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}})^H (\lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}) + \\ &\qquad C_{\mathbf{T}}^T C_{\mathbf{T}} + A_{\mathbf{ST}}^T \Theta^2 A_{\mathbf{ST}} \\ &= \hat{M}_1^H(\lambda) \hat{M}_1(\lambda) \end{aligned} \tag{a.3}$$

It can therefore be declared that, in order to guarantee the observability of the system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, it is necessary that the MVP $\hat{M}_1(\lambda)$ is of FCR at each complex scale λ.

From the block diagonal structure of the matrices $A_{\mathbf{TT}}$, $A_{\mathbf{ST}}$ and $C_{\mathbf{T}}$, as well as Equation (5), it is obvious that

$$\hat{M}_1(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{diag}\{\lambda I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i)|_{i=1}^N\} \\ \mathbf{diag}\{C_{\mathbf{T}}(i)|_{i=1}^N\} \\ \mathbf{diag}\{\Theta(i) A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)|_{i=1}^N\} \end{bmatrix} \tag{a.4}$$

Define MVPs $\hat{M}_{1i}(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{M}_{1i}(\lambda)$ with $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$ as

$$\hat{M}_{1i}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i) \\ C_{\mathbf{T}}(i) \\ \Theta(i) A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{M}_{1i}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i) \\ C_{\mathbf{T}}(i) \\ A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i) \end{bmatrix}$$

Straightforward matrix manipulations show that for each fixed complex λ, the complex valued matrix $\hat{M}_1(\lambda)$ is of FCR, if and only if for each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, the complex valued matrix $\hat{M}_{1i}(\lambda)$ is of FCR. Moreover, clearly from the definitions of the MVPs $\hat{M}_{1i}(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{M}_{1i}(\lambda)$, we have that

$$\hat{M}_{1i}(\lambda) = \mathbf{diag}\left\{ I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}},\ I_{m_{\mathbf{y}i}},\ \Theta(i) \right\} \tilde{M}_{1i}(\lambda) \tag{a.5}$$

Note that the matrix $\Theta(i)$ is positive definite from its definition. It is clear that the MVP $\hat{M}_{1i}(\lambda)$ is of FCR at every complex scale λ, if and only if the MVP $\tilde{M}_{1i}(\lambda)$ is.

The proof can now be completed through a direct application of Lemma 1. ◇

Proof of Theorem 2: From Lemma 3, it can be easily seen that System $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is observable, if and only if for each nonzero vector $x \in \mathcal{C}^{M_{\mathbf{x}} + M_{\mathbf{v}}}$, if there exists a $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$, such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}} & -A_{\mathbf{TS}} \\ -C_{\mathbf{T}} & -C_{\mathbf{S}} \end{bmatrix} x = 0 \tag{a.6}$$

then, with the same complex number λ, the following inequality is valid

$$\left[-\Phi A_{\mathbf{ST}} \ \ I_{M_{\mathbf{v}}} - \Phi A_{\mathbf{SS}} \right] x \neq 0 \tag{a.7}$$

Partition the vector x as $x = \begin{bmatrix} x_1^T & x_2^T \end{bmatrix}$ in which $x_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{M_{\mathbf{x}}}$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{M_{\mathbf{v}}}$. Then, according to Equation (a.6), we have that

$$\left[\lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}} \right] x_1 - A_{\mathbf{TS}} x_2 = 0 \tag{a.8}$$

$$C_{\mathbf{T}} x_1 + C_{\mathbf{S}} x_2 = 0 \tag{a.9}$$

When λ is not an eigenvalue of the matrix $A_{\mathbf{TT}}$, the matrix $\lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}$ is invertible*. In this case, Equation (a.8) implies that $x_1 = \left[\lambda I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}} \right]^{-1} A_{\mathbf{TS}} x_2$. Substitute this relation into Equations (a.7) and (a.9), direct algebraic manipulations show that

$$G^{[1]}(\lambda) x_2 = 0 \tag{a.10}$$

$$\left[I_{M_{\mathbf{v}}} - \Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda) \right] x_2 \neq 0 \tag{a.11}$$

In these derivations, the definitions of the TFMs $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$ and $G^{[2]}(\lambda)$ have been utilized.

Note that every TFM $G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, is assumed to be of FCNR, and the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$ is block diagonal with its i-th diagonal block being $G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)$. It is obvious that the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$ is also of FCNR. It can therefore be declared from Lemma 2 and Equation (a.10) that λ is a transmission zero of the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$. These results imply that when the TFMs $G_i^{[1]}(\lambda)|_{i=1}^N$ are of FCNR, verifications of the conditions in Lemma 3 are necessary only for all the transmission zeros of the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$.

*When this condition is not satisfied, a pseudo-inverse must be taken. As the treatments are completely the same as those of [13], [14], the details are omitted.

Assume that $\lambda = \lambda_0^{[k]}$. Then, according to the definition of the number $\lambda_0^{[k]}$, it is also a transmission zero of the TFM $G_{k(s)}^{[1]}(\lambda)$, $s = 1, 2, \cdots, s^{[k]}$. Moreover, from the definition of the matrix $Y_s^{[k]}$, we have that for every nonzero complex valued vector $\alpha_s \in \mathcal{C}^{p(k,s)}$,

$$G_{k(s)}^{[1]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) Y_s^{[k]} \alpha_s = 0 \tag{a.12}$$

Define a matrix $Y^{[k]}$ as

$$Y^{[k]} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{M_{\mathbf{v},k(1)-1} \times p(k,1)} & \cdots & 0_{M_{\mathbf{v},k(s^{[k]})-1} \times p(k,s^{[k]})} \\ Y_1^{[k]} & \cdots & Y_{s^{[k]}}^{[k]} \\ 0_{(M_{\mathbf{v}} - M_{\mathbf{v},k(1)}) \times p(k,1)} & \cdots & 0_{(M_{\mathbf{v}} - M_{\mathbf{v},k(s^{[k]})}) \times p(k,s^{[k]})} \end{bmatrix}$$

Then, from the block diagonal structure of the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$ and Equation (a.12), it can be directly proved that for each nonzero vector $x_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{M_{\mathbf{v}}}$ satisfying $G^{[1]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) x = 0$, there exists one and only one nonzero $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\sum_{j=1}^{s^{[k]}} p(k,j)}$, such that

$$x_2 = Y^{[k]} \alpha \tag{a.13}$$

On the other hand, based on the block diagonal structures of the TFM $G^{[2]}(\lambda)$ and the matrix Θ, direct algebraic manipulations show that for each complex valued vector x_2 satisfying Equation (a.13), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Theta G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) x_2 \\ &= \mathbf{diag}\{\Theta(i)|_{i=1}^N\} \mathbf{diag}\{G_i^{[2]}(\lambda)|_{i=1}^N\} Y^{[k]} \alpha \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{M_{\mathbf{v},k(1)-1} \times p(k,1)} & \cdots & 0_{M_{\mathbf{v},k(s^{[k]})-1} \times p(k,s^{[k]})} \\ \Theta(k(1)) G_{k(1)}^{[2]}(\lambda) Y_1^{[k]} & \cdots & \Theta(k(s^{[k]})) G_{k(s^{[k]})}^{[2]}(\lambda) Y_{s^{[k]}}^{[k]} \\ 0_{(M_{\mathbf{v}} - M_{\mathbf{v},k(1)}) \times p(k,1)} & \cdots & 0_{(M_{\mathbf{v}} - M_{\mathbf{v},k(s^{[k]})}) \times p(k,s^{[k]})} \end{bmatrix} \alpha \end{aligned} \tag{a.14}$$

Hence,

$$x_2^H x_2 = \alpha^H \mathbf{diag}\left\{ Y_j^{[k]H} Y_j^{[k]} |_{j=1}^{s^{[k]}} \right\} \alpha \tag{a.15}$$

Moreover, from Equation (5), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) x_2 \right)^H \left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) x_2 \right) \\ &= x_2^H G^{[2]H}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) \Theta^2 G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) x_2 \\ &= \left(\Theta G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) x_2 \right)^H \left(\Theta G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) x_2 \right) \end{aligned} \tag{a.16}$$

Substitute the right hand side of Equation (a.14) into that of Equation (a.16), it can be directly proved that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) x_2 \right)^H \left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) x_2 \right) \\ &= \alpha^H \mathbf{diag}\left\{ \left(\Theta(k(j)) G_{k(j)}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) Y_j^{[k]} \right)^H \times \right. \\ &\qquad \left. \left(\Theta(k(j)) G_{k(j)}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]}) Y_j^{[k]} \right) \Big|_{j=1}^{s^{[k]}} \right\} \alpha \end{aligned} \tag{a.17}$$

Denote the vector $\mathbf{diag}\{(Y_j^{[k]H} Y_j^{[k]})^{1/2}|_{j=1}^{s^{[k]}}\}\alpha$ by $\hat{\alpha}$. It can be declared from the FCR property of the matrices $Y_j^{[k]}|_{j=1}^{s^{[k]}}$ that the vector $\hat{\alpha}$ is not equal to zero if and only if the vector α is. On the other hand, from Equations (a.15) and (a.17), as

well as the definitions of the matrices $\Gamma_j^{[k]}|_{j=1}^{s^{[k]}}$, straightforward algebraic manipulations show that

$$\begin{aligned} & x_2^H x_2 - \left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})x_2\right)^H \left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})x_2\right) \\ &= \hat{\alpha}^H \mathbf{diag}\left\{ I_{p(k,s)} - \Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]}\Big|_{s=1}^{s^{[k]}} \right\}\hat{\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad \text{(a.18)}$$

Therefore, if the inequality of Equation (7) is satisfied for each $s = 1, 2, \cdots, s^{[k]}$, then, the matrix $\mathbf{diag}\{I_{p(k,s)} - \Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(k(s))\Gamma_s^{[k]}|_{s=1}^{s^{[k]}}\}$ is positive definite. This means that for an arbitrary nonzero complex vector x_2 satisfying Equation (a.10), it is certain that

$$x_2^H x_2 - \left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})x_2\right)^H \left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})x_2\right) > 0 \quad \text{(a.19)}$$

On the other hand, if for every $s \in \left\{1, 2, \cdots, s^{[k]}\right\}$, the inequality of Equation (8) is satisfied, then, similar arguments show that for each nonzero complex vector x_2 satisfying Equation (a.10), the following inequality is certainly satisfied

$$x_2^H x_2 - \left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})x_2\right)^H \left(\Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})x_2\right) < 0 \quad \text{(a.20)}$$

Therefore, under both of these situations,

$$x_2 \neq \Phi G^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})x_2 \quad \text{(a.21)}$$

Hence, the MVP $M(\lambda)$ is of FCR at each $\lambda = \lambda_0^{[k]}$. This completes the proof. $\diamond$

Proof of Theorem 3: To prove the condition for the necessity, assume that there exists a subsystem, denote it by $\mathbf{\Sigma}_i$, such that the associated matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i),\ [B_{\mathbf{T}}(i)\ \ A_{\mathbf{TS}}(i)])$ is not controllable. Then, according to Lemma 1, there exist at least one $\lambda_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ and one nonzero vector $x_i \in \mathcal{C}^{m_{\mathbf{x}i}}$, such that

$$x_i^H\,[\lambda_0 I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i)\ \ B_{\mathbf{T}}(i)\ \ A_{\mathbf{TS}}(i)] = 0 \quad \text{(a.22)}$$

Define a $M_{\mathbf{x}}$ dimensional vector x as $x = \mathbf{col}\{0_{M_{\mathbf{x},i-1}},\ x_i,\ 0_{M_{\mathbf{x}}-M_{\mathbf{x},i}}\}$. Then, $x \neq 0$. Moreover, from Equation (a.22) and the block diagonal structure of the matrices $A_{\mathbf{TT}}$, $B_{\mathbf{T}}$ and $A_{\mathbf{TS}}$, direct matrix algebraic manipulations show that

$$x^H\,[\lambda_0 I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}\ \ -B_{\mathbf{T}}\ \ -A_{\mathbf{TS}}] = 0 \quad \text{(a.23)}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & [\lambda_0 I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}\ \ -B_{\mathbf{T}}\ \ -A_{\mathbf{TS}}\Phi] \\ &= [\lambda_0 I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}\ \ -B_{\mathbf{T}}\ \ -A_{\mathbf{TS}}]\,\mathbf{diag}\{I_{m_{\mathbf{x}}},\ I_{m_{\mathbf{u}}},\ \Phi\} \end{aligned}$$

We therefore have that the matrix $[\lambda_0 I_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}\ -B_{\mathbf{T}}\ -A_{\mathbf{TS}}\Phi]$ can never be of FRR, no matter how the SCM Φ is designed. Hence, it can be claimed further from the definition of the MVP $\bar{M}(\lambda)$ that it is also never of FRR at $\lambda = \lambda_0$. According to Lemma 1, System $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is not controllable.

To prove the condition for the sufficiency, note that the MVPs $\bar{M}^T(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda)$ have completely the same form. Similar arguments as those for the derivations of Equations (a.10) and (a.11) in the proof of Theorem 2 show that, the MVP $\bar{M}(\lambda)$ is of FRR at each complex number λ, if and only if for each pair $(\lambda,\ x_2)$ satisfying

$$\bar{G}^{[1]}(\lambda)x_2 = 0 \quad \text{(a.24)}$$

in which $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$, and $x_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{M_{\mathbf{z}}}$ and $x_2 \neq 0$, it is certain that

$$\left[I_{M_{\mathbf{z}}} - \Phi^T \bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda)\right] x_2 \neq 0 \quad \text{(a.25)}$$

From the assumption that the TFM $\bar{G}^{[1]}(\lambda)$ is of FCNR and its block diagonal structure, as well as the definitions of the matrices $\bar{Y}_s^{[k]}|_{s=1}^{\bar{s}^{[k]}}$, it can be straightforwardly shown that every λ satisfying Equation (a.24) must be a transmission zero of the TFM $\bar{G}^{[1]}(\lambda)$. Moreover, all the nonzero x_2 satisfying Equation (a.24) with $\lambda = \bar{\lambda}_0^{[k]}$ can be expressed as

$$x_2 = \bar{Y}^{[k]}\alpha \quad \text{(a.26)}$$

in which α is a nonzero $\sum_{s=1}^{\bar{s}^{[k]}} \bar{p}(k,s)$ dimensional complex vector and

$$\bar{Y}^{[k]} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{M_{\mathbf{z},\bar{k}(1)-1}\times\bar{p}(k,1)} & \cdots & 0_{M_{\mathbf{z},\bar{k}(\bar{s}^{[k]})-1}\times\bar{p}(k,\bar{s}^{[k]})} \\ \bar{Y}_1^{[k]} & \cdots & \bar{Y}_{\bar{s}^{[k]}}^{[k]} \\ 0_{(M_{\mathbf{z}}-M_{\mathbf{z},\bar{k}(1)})\times\bar{p}(k,1)} & \cdots & 0_{(M_{\mathbf{z}}-M_{\mathbf{z},\bar{k}(\bar{s}^{[k]})})\times\bar{p}(k,\bar{s}^{[k]})} \end{bmatrix}$$

On the other hand, from Equation (5) and singular value decompositions for a matrix [3], it can be declared that there exist a $U_1 \in \mathcal{R}^{M_{\mathbf{v}}\times M_{\mathbf{z}}}$ and a $U_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{M_{\mathbf{v}}\times(M_{\mathbf{v}}-M_{\mathbf{z}})}$, such that

$$\Phi = U_1\Theta, \quad [U_1\ U_2]^T[U_1\ U_2] = [U_1\ U_2][U_1\ U_2]^T = I_{M_{\mathbf{v}}} \quad \text{(a.27)}$$

Hence, for each x_2 satisfying Equation (a.26), we have that

$$\left[I_{M_{\mathbf{z}}} - \Phi^T\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\right] x_2 = \Theta\left[\Theta^{-1}\bar{Y}^{[k]} - U_1^T\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}^{[k]}\right]\alpha \quad \text{(a.28)}$$

which means that $\left[I_{M_{\mathbf{z}}} - \Phi^T\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\right] x_2 \neq 0$ if and only if

$$\left[\Theta^{-1}\bar{Y}^{[k]} - U_1^T\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}^{[k]}\right]\alpha \neq 0 \quad \text{(a.29)}$$

Note that

$$\left|\left|\Theta^{-1}\bar{Y}^{[k]}\alpha\right|\right|_2^2 = \alpha^H\mathbf{diag}\left\{\bar{Y}_s^{[k]H}\Theta^{-2}(\bar{k}(s))\bar{Y}_s^{[k]}\Big|_{s=1}^{\bar{s}^{[k]}}\right\}\alpha \quad \text{(a.30)}$$

Moreover, from Equation (a.27), we have that $U_1U_1^T = I_{M_{\mathbf{v}}} - U_2U_2^T \leq I_{M_{\mathbf{v}}}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\left|U_1^T\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}^{[k]}\alpha\right|\right|_2^2 \\ &= \alpha^H\bar{Y}^{[k]H}\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]H})U_1U_1^T\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}^{[k]}\alpha \\ &\leq \alpha^H\bar{Y}^{[k]H}\bar{G}^{[2]H}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}^{[k]}\alpha \\ &= \alpha^H\mathbf{diag}\left\{\bar{Y}_s^{[k]H}\bar{G}^{[2]H}_{\bar{k}(s)}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{G}^{[2]}_{\bar{k}(s)}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}_s^{[k]}\Big|_{s=1}^{\bar{s}^{[k]}}\right\}\alpha \end{aligned} \quad \text{(a.31)}$$

which further leads to that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\left|\Theta^{-1}\bar{Y}^{[k]}\alpha\right|\right|_2^2 - \left|\left|U_1^T\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}^{[k]}\alpha\right|\right|_2^2 \\ &\geq \alpha^H\mathbf{diag}\Big\{\Big(\bar{Y}_s^{[k]H}\Theta^{-2}(\bar{k}(s))\bar{Y}_s^{[k]} - \\ &\qquad \bar{Y}_s^{[k]H}\bar{G}^{[2]H}_{\bar{k}(s)}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{G}^{[2]}_{\bar{k}(s)}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}_s^{[k]}\Big)\Big|_{s=1}^{\bar{s}^{[k]}}\Big\}\alpha \\ &= \hat{\alpha}^H\mathbf{diag}\left\{\left(I_{\bar{p}(k,s)} - \bar{\Gamma}_s^{[k]H}\bar{\Gamma}_s^{[k]}\right)\Big|_{s=1}^{\bar{s}^{[k]}}\right\}\hat{\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad \text{(a.32)}$$

in which $\hat{\alpha} = \mathbf{diag}\{(\bar{Y}_s^{[k]H}\Theta^{-2}(\bar{k}(s))\bar{Y}_s^{[k]})^{1/2}|_{s=1}^{\bar{s}^{[k]}}\}\alpha$.

Note that the matrix $\bar{Y}_s^{[k]H}\Theta^{-2}(\bar{k}(s))\bar{Y}_s^{[k]}$ is invertible for each feasible integer pair $(k,\ s)$. It is obvious that the vector

α is nonzero if and only if the vector $\hat{\alpha}$ is. Therefore, if the condition of Equation (10) is satisfied, then, for any nonzero $\sum_{s=1}^{\bar{s}^{[k]}} \bar{p}(k,s)$ dimensional complex vector α, we have that

$$\left|\left|\Theta^{-1}\bar{Y}^{[k]}\alpha\right|\right|_2^2 - \left|\left|U_1^T\bar{G}^{[2]}(\lambda_0^{[k]})\bar{Y}^{[k]}\alpha\right|\right|_2^2 > 0 \qquad \text{(a.33)}$$

Hence, the condition of Equation (a.29) is satisfied, which means that the system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is controllable. This completes the proof. $\diamond$

Proof of Theorem 4: From Theorem 1, we have that in order to guarantee the observability of the networked system $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, it is necessary that for each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i), [C_{\mathbf{T}}^T(i)\ A_{\mathbf{ST}}^T(i)]^T)$ is observable. It can therefore be declared from Lemma 4 that to construct an observable $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, it is necessary that $m_{\mathbf{y}i} + m_{\mathbf{z}i} \geq p_{max}(i)$.

Now, assume that $m_{\mathbf{y}i} + m_{\mathbf{z}i} = p_{max}(i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq N$. Then, according to Lemma 4, there always exists a matrix $C_{\mathbf{T}}(i)$ and a matrix $A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$, such that the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i), [C_{\mathbf{T}}^T(i)\ A_{\mathbf{ST}}^T(i)]^T)$ is observable.

Note that for an arbitrary real number κ_i, we have that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i) \\ C_{\mathbf{T}}(i) \\ \kappa_i A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i) \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{diag}\{I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}},\ I_{m_{\mathbf{y}i}},\ \kappa_i I_{m_{\mathbf{z}i}}\} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{m_{\mathbf{x}i}} - A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i) \\ C_{\mathbf{T}}(i) \\ A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i) \end{bmatrix}$$

It is clear from Lemma 1 that observability of the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i), \mathbf{col}\{C_{\mathbf{T}}(i),\ \kappa_i A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)\})$ is equivalent to that of the matrix pair $(A_{\mathbf{TT}}(i), \mathbf{col}\{C_{\mathbf{T}}(i),\ A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)\})$, provided that $\kappa_i \neq 0$.

For each $j \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ N\ \}$, define a set $\mathcal{J}(j)$ as

$$\mathcal{J}(j) = \left\{ (k,s) \;\middle|\; k(s) = j, \quad \begin{array}{c} s \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ s^{[k]}\ \} \\ k \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ m\ \} \end{array} \right\}$$

That is, this set is associated with all the transmission zeros of the TFM $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$ that is also a transmission zero of the TFM $G_j^{[1]}(\lambda)$ with $j \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ N\ \}$. Then, obviously, the satisfaction of Equation (7) can be equivalently expressed as that for each $j = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, the following inequality

$$I_{p(k,s)} - \Gamma_s^{[k]H}\Theta^2(j)\Gamma_s^{[k]} > 0 \qquad \text{(a.34)}$$

is satisfied for every pair (k,s) of the set $\mathcal{J}(j)$.

For a fixed SCM Φ, define γ_i as

$$\gamma_i = \max\left\{\sigma_{max}(\Theta(i)A_{\mathbf{SS}}(i)),\ \max_{(k,s)\in\mathcal{J}(i)}\sigma_{max}\left(\Theta(i)\Gamma_s^{[k]}\right)\right\} \qquad \text{(a.35)}$$

in which $\sigma_{max}(\cdot)$ stands for the maximal singular value of a matrix. Moreover, for each subsystem of System $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, define matrices $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)$ and $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}(i)$ respectively as

$$\hat{A}_{\mathbf{ST}}(i) = \kappa_i A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i), \qquad \hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}(i) = \kappa_i A_{\mathbf{SS}}(i) \qquad \text{(a.36)}$$

in which κ_i is an arbitrary number belonging to $(0,\ 1/\gamma_i)$.

Using these two matrices, construct a new networked system $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ through simply replacing the system matrices $A_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)$ and $A_{\mathbf{SS}}(i)$ respectively by $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)$ and $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}(i)$, while keeping the other system matrices unchanged. Moreover, define matrices $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}$, $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{ST}}$, etc., as well as the TFMs $\hat{G}^{[1]}(\lambda)$, $\hat{G}^{[2]}(\lambda)$, etc., respectively as their counterparts associated with System $\mathbf{\Sigma}$.

Based on the block diagonal structure of the matrix $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}$ and Equation (5), it can be straightforwardly proved that $(\Phi\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}})^T(\Phi\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}) = \mathbf{diag}\{\kappa_i^2 A_{\mathbf{SS}}^T(i)\Theta^2(i)A_{\mathbf{SS}}(i)|_{i=1}^N\}$. Hence, it can be claimed from Equations (a.35) and (a.36) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{max}\left(\Phi\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}\right) &= \max_{1\leq i\leq N}\left\{\sigma_{max}\left(\Theta(i)\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}(i)\right)\right\} \\ &= \max_{1\leq i\leq N}\left\{\kappa_i \times \sigma_{max}\left(\Theta(i)A_{\mathbf{SS}}(i)\right)\right\} \\ &< 1 \end{aligned} \qquad \text{(a.37)}$$

Note that the absolute value of each eigenvalue of a square matrix is not greater than its maximal singular value [3]. It can therefore be declared that the matrix I–$\Phi\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}$ is invertible, and hence the re-constructed networked system $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ is well-posed.

On the other hand, note that in System $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$, only the matrices $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{ST}}(i)$ and $\hat{A}_{\mathbf{SS}}(i)$ are different from those of System $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. This implies that the TFMs $G^{[1]}(\lambda)$ and $\hat{G}^{[1]}(\lambda)$, their transmission zeros, as well as the associated matrices $Y_s^{[k]}$, are completely the same. It can therefore be declared from the definition of the matrix $\Gamma_s^{[k]}$ that for each integer pair $(k,\ s)$ with $k \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ m\ \}$ and $s \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ s^{[k]}\ \}$, there certainly exists one and only one $j \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ N\ \}$, such that their pair (k,s) belongs to the set $\mathcal{J}(j)$. This further leads to that

$$\hat{\Gamma}_s^{[k]} = \kappa_j\Gamma_s^{[k]} \qquad \text{(a.38)}$$

Hence, we have from Equations (a.35) and (a.36) that

$$\sigma_{max}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_s^{[k]}\Theta(j)\right) = \kappa_j\sigma_{max}\left(\Gamma_s^{[k]}\Theta(j)\right) < 1 \qquad \text{(a.39)}$$

which further implies the satisfaction of the condition of Equation (a.34) for each element of the set $\mathcal{J}(j)$ and each $j \in \{\ 1,\ 2,\ \cdots,\ N\ \}$, and hence the system $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ is observable.

The results on minimal input selection for system controllability can be established directly using duality between controllability and observability of a dynamic system, as well as the sufficient condition of Theorem 3.

This completes the proof. $\diamond$

REFERENCES

[1] C.Commault and J.M.Dion, "Input addition and leader selection for the controllability of graph-based systems", *Automatica*, Vol.49, pp.3322∼3328, 2013.

[2] J.M.Hendrickx, A.Olshevsky and J.N.Tsitsiklis, "Distributed anonymous discrete function computation", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol.56, No.10, pp.2276∼2289, 2011.

[3] R.A.Horn and C.R.Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

[4] Y.Y.Liu, J.J.Slotine and A.L.Barabasi, "Controllability of complex networks", *Nature*, Vol.473, No.7346, pp.167∼173, 2011.

[5] A.Olshevsky, "Minimal controllability problems", *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, Vol.1, No.3, pp.249∼258, 2014.

[6] S.Pequito, S.Kar and A. P.Aguiar, "A framework for structural input/output and control configuration selection in large-scale systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol.61, No.2, pp.303∼318, 2016.

[7] M.A.Rahimian and A.G.Aghdam, "Structural controllability of multi-agent networks: robustness against simultaneous failures", *Automatica*, Vol.49, pp.3149∼3157, 2013.

[8] D.D.Siljak, *Large-scale Dynamic Systems: Stability and Structure*, North-Holland Books, New York, 1978.

[9] T.H.Summers, F.L.Cortesi and J.Lygeros, "On submodularity and controllability in complex dynamical networks", *arXiv:1404.7665v2* [math.OC], January 12, 2015

[10] J.H.van Schuppen, O.Boutin, P.L.Kempker, J.Komenda, T.Masopust, N.Pambakian and A.C.M.Ran, "Control of distributed systems: tutorial and overview", *European Journal of Control*, Vol.17, No.5-6, pp.579∼602, 2011.

[11] M.van de Wal and B.de Jager, ”A review of methods for input/output selection”, *Automatica*, Vol.37, pp.487∼510, 2001.
[12] K.M.Zhou, J.C.Doyle and K.Glover, *Robust and Optimal Control*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 1996.
[13] T.Zhou, ”On the controllability and observability of networked dynamic systems”, *Automatica*, Vol.52, pp.63∼75, 2015.
[14] Y.Zhang and T.Zhou, ”A reinvestigation on the controllability and observability of networked dynamic systems”, *Proc. of the 34th Chinese Control Conference*, Hanzhou, China, 2015, pp.6740∼6746.
[15] T.Zhou, ”Controllability of a networked system with input and state constraints” (in Chinese), *Sci Sin Math*, Vol.46, No.10, pp.1603∼1616, (doi: 10.1360/N012015-00388), 2016.
[16] T.Zhou, ”Minimal control selection for a networked system”, *arXiv*:1610.00063v1[cs.SY], 2016.
[17] T.Zhou and Y.Zhang, ”On the stability and robust stability of networked dynamic systems”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol.61, No.6, pp.1595∼1600, 2016.
[18] Y.Zhang and T.Zhou, ”Controllability analysis for a networked dynamic system with autonomous subsystems”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, accepted (doi: 10.1109/TAC.2016.2612831), 2016.